

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/623,487

Applicant(s)

ZHOA ET AL.

Examiner

Dr. Kelechi C. Egwim

Art Unit

1713

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Dr. Kelechi C. Egwim.

(3) _____

(2) Dr. Kirsten Grueneberg. K.G.

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 14 August 2002 .

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____ .

Claim(s) discussed: All .

Identification of prior art discussed: All .

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet .

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's representative proposed amendments to overcome the present rejections. The first amendments attempted to be further define the percentage composition of the claimed polymeric binders. However, the suggested percentages and monomers were well within the teachings of the applied prior art and therefore would not be persuasive to overcome the references. Secondly, Applicant proposed amendment to over come the 112 rejections and the possibility in including a siloxane moiety into the polymeric binder in order to more specifically define the binder and overcome the references. .